

and 70-72 have been amended, and new claims 73 and 74 have been added in order to better define that which applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-12, 17-30, 33-43, 48-63, and 68-74 are presently pending in the instant application.

Referring now to the Examiner's *Action*, particularly page 2 thereof, the drawings have been objected to because Figure 1 is admitted as a prior art figure and should be provided with a prior art legend. Filed concurrently herewith is a *Request For Drawing Change Approval* wherein Figure 1 has been labeled as "Prior Art." The Examiner's consideration and approval of such amendment is earnestly solicited.

The disclosure has been objected to because of minor informalities. Particularly, the *Brief Description Of The Drawings* does not include a description of Figure 6B. As can be seen from the foregoing amendments, the specification has been amended at page 11 to include a description of Figure 6B. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that applicants' specification as presently amended is in proper formal condition for allowance.

With reference now to the merits of the several claims, claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 12, 13, 22, 25, 33, 34, 44, 53, 54, 60, 63, and 64 have been rejected as being anticipated by U.S. patent 3,731,620 issued to Klemmer. This rejection is respectfully traversed in that the patent to Klemmer neither discloses nor remotely suggests that which is presently set forth in applicants' claimed invention.

As can be seen from the foregoing amendments, each of independent claims 1, 22, 33, and 53 have been amended in order to incorporate the limitations of the particular positioning means set forth by applicants' claimed

invention. The patent to Klemmer neither discloses nor suggests such a structure.

The Klemmer reference as noted by the Examiner merely teaches the concept of releasably attaching a sleeve having pattern thereon on an embossing roller core so as to facilitate the replacement of the engraved sleeve without having to remove the entire embossing roller from the machine. However, this reference fails to disclose or suggest a particular mechanism for accomplishing the interchangeability of the sleeve as is specifically recited by applicants claimed invention. Accordingly, the patent to Klemmer fails to anticipate that which is presently set forth in each of the independent claims 1, 22, 33, and 53, as well as those claims that depend therefrom. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that such claims clearly distinguish over the teachings of Klemmer.

Claims 3-7, 26-30, 35-40, and 55-59 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Klemmer in view of U.S. patent 5,266,257 issued to Kildune. Again, this rejection is respectfully traversed in that the patent to Kildune does nothing to overcome the aforementioned shortcomings associated with the Klemmer disclosure.

While the patent to Kildune may disclose that it is conventional to provide an embossing roller core with a vulcanized rubber sleeve to carry out the embossing function, this reference clearly fails to disclose or suggest the particular positioning means set forth in each of the several independent claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 3-7, 26-30, 35-40, and 55-59 likewise distinguish over the prior art of record for the reasons discussed hereinabove.

Claims 10, 11, 23, 24, 41-43, 61, and 62 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Klemmer in view of U.S. patent 3,404,254 issued to Jones. This rejection is likewise respectfully traversed in that the patent to Jones does nothing to overcome the aforementioned shortcomings associated with the patent to Klemmer.

Although the patent to Jones discloses a method and apparatus for engraving a circular shape body using a laser, this reference discloses a conventional two-dimensional laser and does not disclose or suggest using three-dimensional lasing engraving techniques to engrave an embossing pattern. Additionally, while dependent claims 10, 23, 41, and 61 merely recite an embossed pattern being laser engraved in the outer surface, each of these claims are either directly or indirectly dependent upon their respective independent claims, which includes features not found in either the Klemmer or Jones references. Accordingly, each of the claims 10, 11, 23, 24, 41-43, 61 and 62 are believed to be in proper condition for allowance for the reasons discussed hereinabove.

Insofar as the Jones reference applies to new independent claims 73 and 74, each of these claims recite an embossing apparatus for embossing a substantially continuous web wherein the embossing pattern is engraved in an outer surface of the sleeve by way of a three-dimensional laser engraving process such that the embossing elements have curvilinear side walls and spherical surfaces and multiple elevations with respect to a reference surface. With the laser engraving system set forth by Jones, such curvilinear side walls and spherical surfaces and multiple elevations with respect to a reference surface are not possible. The patent to Jones discloses nothing more than the prior art discussed by applicants with respect to Figure 6A. Moreover, the

elements engraved by Jones are not for use in an embossing apparatus. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that each of independent claims 73 and 74 clearly distinguishes over the prior art of record, and are in proper condition for allowance.


In addition to the foregoing, claims 14-21, 31, 32, 45-52, and 65-72 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Klemmer in view of U.S. patent 4,144,813 issued to Julian. This rejection is respectfully traversed in that the patent to Julian fails to overcome the aforementioned shortcomings associated with the patent to Klemmer.

Particularly, applicants claimed invention is directed toward an embossing apparatus for embossing a substantially continuous web of sheet material, as well as a method of embossing, while the patent to Julian is directed to a printing operation. Clearly, the forces exerted on a printing roll in a printing process are significantly different than that exerted on an embossing roll. Consequently, one of ordinary skill in the art of embossing would not turn to the printing art due to the significantly different nature of the two processes. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 22, 33, and 53 as presently amended clearly distinguish applicants' claimed invention over the prior art combination proposed by the Examiner.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing it is respectfully requested that the objections and rejections of record be reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner, and that claims 1-12, 17-30, 33-43, 48-63, and 68-74 be allowed and that the application be passed to issue.

Should the Examiner believe a conference would be of benefit in expediting the prosecution of the instant application, he is hereby invited to telephone counsel to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,



Donald R. Studebaker
Reg. No. 32,815

Sixbey, Friedman, Leedom & Ferguson, P.C.
2010 Corporate Ridge, Suite 600
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 790-9110